

STEPHEN DOUGLAS CAMPBELL + SUPPORT

DRAWER 9

CAMPBELL - 1860

71.2009.025.04206

Abraham Lincoln's Political Career through 1860

Stephen Douglas
Campaign & Support

Excerpts from newspapers and other sources

From the files of the
Lincoln Financial Foundation Collection

THE DEMOCRAT.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 26, 1860.

FOR PRESIDENT IN 1860
STEP'N. A. DOUGLAS.
•Of Illinois.

Subject to the decision of a Democratic National Convention.

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET,
For 1860.

FOR GOVERNOR,
THOMAS A. HENDRICKS, of Shelby.

FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR,
DAVID TURPIE, of White.

FOR SECRETARY OF STATE,
WILLIAM M. SCHLATER, of Wayne.

FOR AUDITOR OF STATE,
JOSEPH RISTINE, of Fountain.

FOR TREASURER OF STATE,
NAT'L. F. CUNNINGHAM, of Vigo.

FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL,
OSCAR B. HORD, of Decatur.

FOR SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
SAMUEL L. RUGG, of Allen.

FOR CLERK OF SUPREME COURT,
CORNELIUS O'BRIEN, of Dearborn.

FOR REPORTER OF SUPREME COURT,
MICHAEL C. KERR, of Floyd.

Douglas Against Lincoln.

That Judge Douglas, will be the nominee of the Baltimore Convention, we cannot for a moment doubt. In fact the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, by the Republicans at Chicago, will have the effect to force the nomination of the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, at Baltimore. Assuming then, what will be the fact, that Douglas and Lincoln, are the standard bearers of the two great contending political parties of the nation, it may be desirable to know where the gentlemen stand upon the all absorbing questions that agitate the country. The history of Douglas, is in the mouth of every school boy, and his position as a leading politician is so well understood by every leading person that it would be a work of supererogation, on our part, to allude to it, but we will only add that he stands pledged, by his speeches, by his acts and by his integrity as an honest man, to the great doctrine of *popular sovereignty*. That the people of the Territories like those of the States shall decide for themselves their local and domestic affairs, *Slavery included*. That if they want slavery, they can have it, and if they don't want slavery they can exclude it by unfriendly legislation. Mr. Douglas, believes that Congress has no right to decide upon the question of slavery in the Territories at all, neither to protect nor exclude it, but that the people themselves have the right to do as they please on the subject. Non-intervention by Congress in the affairs of the Territories, is the doctrine of Judge Douglas, and Non-intervention, is the doctrine of the Democracy, who have stood to the principles of 1856. We admit, and with shame be it spoken, that many men calling themselves Democrats, with Buchanan, at their head, have wandered off into the camp of the enemy, and for the doctrines of intervention. But they are only a handful, compared to the hosts who have rallied upon the conservatism of the Cincinnati platform, and under the gifted leadership of Douglas. In 1850, Judge Douglas, planted himself upon the great Democratic doctrine of non-intervention, and in the mutations of time and notwithstanding the tergiversations of political tricksters who endeavored to control the party, he has stood as firm as adamant to the cardinal doctrines of the compromise measures of 1850, the Kansas-Nebraska bill of 1854, and the platform of 1856, and during the fearful struggle of 1858, when a debauched and degraded administration tried to force an odious Constitution upon a free people. Mr. Douglas stood on the side of liberty and justice, and for the rights of an outraged people. And to-day the record of Douglas, stands out to the nation in its purity, without a single stain of dishonor or inconsistency upon it.

Where stands the Republican candidate Mr. Lincoln? Not upon the great doctrine of Non-intervention, but in favor of *intervention*. He denies to the people of the Territories the right to regulate their own domestic institutions. He would have Congress to do that for them, and in denying this, he would take from them the dearest boon of freedom. He goes further, he would destroy the beautiful fabric reared by the hands of our patriot fathers. His doctrine is that the states cannot exist under a common bond of Union half free and half slave, why? Because he says there is an irrepressible conflict between the two. Is this true? Have we not prospered and progressed as a nation for eighty odd years. Where is the evidence of this "irrepressible conflict," except in the fevered imagination of extreme men? Surely that evidence is not to be found in the fact that the North and South have advanced from sparsely settled States, to thirty three large and popular commonwealths whose opulence and energy feed and clothe the balance of the civilized world. When Mr. Lincoln, asserted the following proposition, at Chicago in 1858, he asserted that, which cannot be satisfactorily established in the minds of intelligent men.

In the Illinois canvass for that year Mr. Lincoln, laid down the following as his main proposition to-wit:

"In my opinion it [the slavery agitation] will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this government can not endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the farther spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States—old as well as new, North as well as South."

Thus it will be seen that under the auspices of a political party, which claims sovereignty in Congress over the subject of slavery, there can be no peace on the slavery questions—no truce in sectional strife—no fraternity between the North and South, so long as this Union remains as our fathers made it—divided into free and slave States, with the right on the part of each to retain slavery so long as it chooses, and to abolish it whenever it pleases.

We ask conservative men, to choose between Douglas and Lincoln. Between Popular Sovereignty on the one side, and Congressional intervention on the other. Are you for the rights of the people and popular liberty, or are you against them?

The War of Slang.

The Republican party, tired of the discussion of principle, and fearful of meeting the Democracy upon Constitutional issues before the people, have determined to substitute for a campaign of principle, a war of slang! This was the reason that SEWARD was thrown overboard, and the rail-splitting LINCOLN substituted.

Thus, at the ratification meeting in New York city, the character of the appeals to the people, is given by the press:

The rear of the platform was decorated with American flags, and a number of transparencies, on which were such inscriptions as the following:

"Tall Abe—give him room to stretch."

"Poor J. B.—let him rest."

"Long tank, lean Abe."

"Tammany on its last legs."

"Abe, the giant-killer."

"Seymour declines running."

"All the way from Illinois."

"Long Abe."

"Honest Abe."

And many others of like import. And soon after the organization the Ninth Ward Republican Association arrived, bearing a "Lincoln Rail," presented to the Republican General Committee by Col. A. L. Chelam, of Galena, Ill., and a banner on which was a likeness of Abraham Lincoln, in the act of splitting a rail. The entrance of the rail created great enthusiasm.

Four years ago, when the Opposition were animated by sentiments, the appeals to the people took the form of mottoes like these: "Free Territories for Freemen." "No extension of Slavery." "Free speech and free homesteads," &c. The appeal was false, so far as it impeached the fidelity of the Democracy to the cause of freedom, or of the people; but it appealed to nobler aspirations than the slang of the Lincolnites of to-day.

We do not regret that our adversaries have lowered their tone. They deem it artful thus "to stoop to conquer," but they will find they stoop to fall.

The campaign has already opened with a defeat—and a signal defeat,—for the Democratic majority in New Haven is nearly equal to the whole Republican majority in the State two months since.

The *Eve. Journal* begins to see the effect of this miserable error of policy, and says: *ALBANY, N. Y. JOURNAL*

ALBANY, N. Y. JOURNAL
While cities like New Haven roll up Democratic majorities by the thousand, and States like Rhode Island do worse, it would seem that the northern States are still "missionary ground," requiring Republican cultivation. We have only to compare those portions of the North where such cultivation is attended to, with those that are neglected, to find where Republican majorities most prevail. A more dangerous error does not exist than the idea that the people are sufficiently enlightened in Republican principles. The universal circulation of Republican newspapers and Republican speeches, is the "one thing needful" to secure a Republican triumph. The conscience of the Northern States is not yet sufficiently aroused, and in many localities a lamentable "lack of conviction" still prevails. *6. 11. 1866*

The *Journal* is right. Its party is demoralized, and is destined to reap the fruits of depravation in defeat. Nor is it now possible to retrieve the blunder which is made in the record. The leaders at Chicago chose to make this a campaign of slang. They distrusted the people, and they deemed it best to substitute a low and catch-penny demagoguism for the high appeals that had called together a great party.

It was a fatal error. The party that believes in the people—believes in their intelligence, their good and high feeling and their intelligent appreciation of national interests, will win the people. Let the Democratic party not fail to stand on this, their old ground, and the victory is theirs.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's Letter of Declination.

The following is Mr. Fitzpatrick's letter declining to run on the Douglas ticket for Vice-President:

"WASHINGTON, June 25, 1859.

"Your letter of to-day, informing me that I have been unanimously nominated by the National Convention of the democratic party, which met at Charleston on the 23d day of April last, and adjourned to meet at Baltimore on the 18th day of June, as their candidate for the office of Vice-President, was duly received. Acknowledging with the liveliest sensibility this distinguished mark of your confidence and regard, it is with no ordinary feelings of regret that considerations, the recital of which I will not impose upon you, constrain me to decline the nomination so flatteringly tendered. My designation as a candidate for this high position would have been more gratifying to me if it had proceeded from a united democracy—united both as to principles and to men. The distracting differences at present existing in the ranks of the democratic party were strikingly exemplified at Charleston and at Baltimore, and, in my humble opinion, distinctly admonish me that I should in no way contribute to these unfortunate divisions. The Black Republicans have harmoniously (at least in convention) presented their candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. So have the constitutional union party, as it is termed. Each party is already engaged in the contest. In the presence of such organizations we still unfortunately exhibit a divided camp. What a melancholy spectacle! It is calculated to cause every democratic citizen, who cherishes the constitution of his country to despond, if not despair, of the durability of the Union. Desirous, as far as I am capable of exercising any influence, to remove every obstacle which may prevent a restoration of the peace, harmony and perfect concord of that glorious old party to which I have been inflexibly devoted from early manhood—a party which, in my deliberate opinion, is the only real and reliable ligament which binds the South, the North, the East and the West together upon constitutional principles—no alternative was left to me but that which I have herein most respectfully communicated to you. For the agreeable manner in which you have conveyed to me the action of the Convention, accept my sincere thanks."

B. FITZPATRICK."

Mr. Douglas's Letter of Acceptance.

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1860.
Gentlemen: In accordance with the verbal assurance which I gave you when you placed in my hands the authenticated evidence of my nomination for the Presidency by the National Convention of the democratic party, I now send you my formal acceptance. Upon a careful examination of the platform of principles adopted at Charleston and reaffirmed at Baltimore, with an additional resolution which is in perfect harmony with the others, I find it to be a faithful embodiment of the time-honored principles of the democratic party, as the same were proclaimed and understood by all parties in the Presidential contests of 1848, 1852 and 1856.

Upon looking into the proceedings of the Convention also, I find that the nomination was made with great unanimity, in the presence and with the concurrence of more than two-thirds of the whole number of delegates, and in accordance with the long established usages of the party. My inflexible purpose not to be a candidate, nor accept the nomination under any contingency, except as the regular nominee of the national democratic party, and in that case only upon the condition that the usages, as well as the principles of the party, should be strictly adhered to, had been proclaimed for a long time and become well known to the country. These conditions having all been complied with by the free and voluntary action of the democratic masses and their faithful representatives, without any agency, interference, or procurement on my part, I feel bound in honor and duty to accept the nomination. In taking this step I am not unmindful of the responsibilities it imposes, but with firm reliance upon Divine Providence I have the faith that the people will comprehend the true nature of the issues involved, and eventually maintain the right.

The peace of the country and perpetuity of the Union have been put in jeopardy by attempts to interfere with and control the domestic affairs of the people in the territories, through the agency of the federal government. If the power and the duty of federal interference is to be conceded, two hostile sectional parties must be the inevitable result—the one inflaming the passions and ambition of the North, the other of the South, and each struggling to use the federal power and authority for the aggrandizement of its own section, at the expense and equal rights of the other, and in derogation of those fundamental principles of self-government which were firmly established in this country by the American Revolution, as the basis of our entire republican system.

During the memorable period of our political history, when the advocates of federal intervention upon the subject of slavery in the territories had well nigh "precipitated the country into revolution," the northern interventionists demanding the Wilmot Proviso for the prohibition of slavery, and the southern interventionists, then few in number, and without a single representative in either house of Congress, insisting upon Congressional legislation for the protection of slavery, in opposition to the wishes of the people in either case, it will be remembered that it required all the wisdom, power and influence of a Clay and a Webster and a Cass, supported by the conservative and patriotic men of the whig and democratic parties of that day to devise and carry out a line of policy which would restore peace to the country and stability to the Union. The essential living principle of that policy, as applied in the legislation of 1850, was, and now is, non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the territories. The fair application of this just and equitable principle restored harmony and fraternity to a distracted country. If we now depart from that wise and just policy which produced these happy results, and permit the country to be again distracted; if precipitated into revolution by a sectional contest between pro-slavery and anti-slavery interventionists, where shall we look for another Clay, another Webster, or another Cass to pilot the ship of state over the breakers into a haven of peace and safety.

The federal Union must be preserved. The constitution must be maintained inviolate in all its parts. Every right guaranteed by the constitution must be protected by law in all cases where legislation is necessary to its engagements. The judicial authority, as provided in the constitution, must be sustained, and its decisions implicitly obeyed and faithfully executed. The laws must be administered and the constituted authorities upheld, and all unlawful resistance to these things must be put down with firmness, impartiality and fidelity, if we expect to enjoy and transmit unimpaired to our posterity that blessed inheritance which we have received in trust from the patriots and sages of the revolution.

With sincere thanks for the kind and agreeable manner in which you made known to me the action of the Convention,

I have the honor to be

Your friend and fellow citizen,

S. A. DOUGLAS.

Hon. Wm. H. Ludlow, of New York; R. P. Dick, of North Carolina; P. C. Wickliff, of Louisiana, and others of Committee.

REMARKS

SUGGESTED

BY THE SPEECH OF

GOV. POWELL,

AT THE

BRECKINRIDGE

Ratification Meeting,

In Henderson, Kentucky,

OF THE

21st of July, 1860.

BY C. W. HUTCHEN.

FELLOW CITIZENS: Fortunately for me, I have no occasion to fortify myself by an hour's apology before entering upon the remarks I design to make. My quondam political friend, Gov. Powell, has devoted about that amount of labor in a futile attempt to satisfy you that he is yet in the ranks of the old school democracy. I regret that events, coupled with truth, compel me to say, that my especial personal friend, Gov. Powell, is not now in the fold of democracy—not admitted into the councils of that good old party; but is regarded by the old soldiers as an alien to the household of faith. He is understood to form a component part of a revolutionary faction, that split off from the true democracy, and he now stands ranged under a disunion flag, which was reared by disorganizers of the South, with Wm. L. Yancey, of Alabama, at their head. If I shall fail to convince you of the truth of what I say, it will be because you will reject testimony having *willed* against the conclusion.

I have said that I have no explanation to offer by way of paving my way before the democracy of the country. No, fellow-citizens, it will suffice to say that at my earliest manhood, I took my political stand in the ranks of the democratic party—not, however, without having acquainted myself with its principles and its policy. From that day to the present I have kept the faith. About twenty years of the forty, of my political life, have been spent in your midst, hence you can bear testimony to my fidelity—as yet I have had no occasion to change my political views or sentiments. It seems, however, that my friend, the Governor, (by whose side, and under whose flag I have done battle,) has at last *dodged*—he is not with me, as heretofore, in the ranks doing battle under the old flag.—Why is this? I ask, *why* is this? I impugn not his motives—I arraign his conduct.

For many years past it has been the custom of the democratic party to assemble county, State and National Conventions. The purposes of which we all

know—to harmonize on *men* and fix upon *policy*—the principles being understood and permanent, and to concentrate our strength. These are the great purposes of conventions.

Now, fellow-citizens, we have before us the anomaly of a censored democracy. We have it, too, from the lips of our quondam friend, Gov. Powell, that the split is upon a cardinal principle—the great principle of *non-intervention* with slavery in the Territories by Congress—that principle which every democrat, from President Buchanan, Vice President Breckinridge, and Senator Powell, down to the humblest member of the party had subscribed to for the past twelve years—that principle which was incorporated into the creed of the democratic party by the National Democracy, in Convention, at Cincinnati, in June, 1856—that principle which enabled the party to triumph so gloriously in that year. It was then regarded by our friend Powell, good enough to stand by and maintain—he has stood by and maintained it ever since, until this disunion flag was unfurled. He advocated it last year in his support of Mr. Magoffin for Governor, and Dr. Poyton for Congress, as well as in the advocacy of the election of all the other officers of State. And I may go further in this connection. The Democratic State Convention that presented that ticket, re-affirmed the Cincinnati platform of '56, without the semblance of change.

Where is Gov. Powell now? He has answered the question for himself—he is in the *intervention* ranks—in the ranks of a party diametrically opposed to the principle of *non-intervention*. He has told you that this is the only split between the Douglas and Breckinridge wings of the party—this split on intervention by Congress with slavery in the Territories—and that split is on principle. So you see he is gone—he has deserted the democratic party and one of its cardinal principles. He is now ranged under the folds of a disunion flag, as I propose presently to prove, and to prove so conclusively that he, himself, must believe it, however reluctant he may be to acknowledge the fact. Let me not be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that the rank and file who are advocating the election of Mr. Breckinridge are disunionists, or disorganizers. But I do charge that their action in the premises so far aids the disunionists in their revolutionary purposes.

If I shall be tedious—if I shall look back through a long vista of years, it will be solely to attract attention to facts within the knowledge of all men of my own age, and to revive a recollection of them in the minds of younger men who only know them as recorded on the page of our country's history. The truths of which I shall speak are relevant and important. My object in making the reference is, to show beyond cavil or contradiction, that a spirit of *revolution* and *secession* has abided in the extreme South for *all* these many years—that though the evil spirit had at times quietly slumbered it was only refreshing itself, gathering momentum for another and more vigorous outbreak in the hope of final success.

Go back with me to the year 1824, then there was a rival spirit—an antagonistic

spirit manifested in the South on account of the operation of tariff laws of that day. That spirit became turbulent, and the North was charged with tyrannical aggression. Subsequently, in 1828, the tariff duties were increased, and the ravings of the South (I allude to the malcontents only) became hideous—the doctrine of States' Rights was announced by Mr. Calhoun, of whom it was said, his influence was so great, that when "he took snuff, all South Carolina sneezed." Such was the prevalence of this spirit between the years '28 and '32, under the lead of Gen. Hayne and Mr. McDuffie, two leading spirits of the South, and especially of South Carolina, an organized military force was raised with the avowed purpose of resisting the execution of the Federal Laws in that State. The whole country

at that time was terror stricken for the fate of the Union. These men had thrown off all disguise and held themselves in readiness to proceed in their treasonable designs, at the expense of the effusion of fratricidal blood, and widespread devastation. But, fellow-citizens, Gen. Jackson was at the helm of the ship of State, than whom a purer, loftier patriot and braver soldier never inhaled the air of freedom. He, on the 10th of December, 1832, issued a proclamation which for soundness of argument and pathos of sentiment has no parallel in our national archives. It had its effect; the traitors quailed, the foul spirit that prompted the treason recoiled and encoined itself in darkness; the better to fortify for another and more formidable assault upon the integrity of the Federal Union. That *warlike*, *and* *warlike* spirit has been nurtured ever since by the ultraists of the South.

Again, in 1848, this same spirit burst forth, volcano-like, through that Prince of Disunionists, Wm. L. Yancey, of Alabama. He left his *Protest* on the records of the Baltimore Convention, against the principle of non-intervention. He has kept up the agitation ever since. It was this *unholy* and *treasonable* spirit that prompted the "League of United Southerners" in 1853, whose action is a part of our country's history. Failing in their purpose by the means employed, Mr. Yancey and others, of like ilk, had recourse to another more potent expedient, the result of which is yet in the womb of futurity. Its success depends upon the defeat of Mr. Douglas and the consequent overthrow of the National Democratic party—the only political organization having the power and the will to save the Union.

Having shown to you the frequent attempts and utter failure of the disunionists of the South to execute their treasonable designs—having further shown that the Tariff rock was insufficient to wreck the ship of State upon in 1832; and having alluded to the shrinking back of the damnable spirit into some unseen cavern to prepare for another and more deadly assault, I now come to the point of attack—the *modus operandi* which is so clearly portrayed by Mr. Yancey in his letter to Mr. Slaughter, of June 15, 1858, as follows:

MONTGOMERY, June 15, 1858.

DEAR SIR:—Your kind favor of the 13th is received.

I cordly agree with you that a general movement can be made that will clear out the nigger stable. If the Democracy were overthrown, it would result in giving place to a greasier and hangrier swarm of flies.

The remedy of the South is not in such a process. It is in a *difficult* organization of her true men for prompt resistance to the next aggression. It must come in the nature of things. No national party can save us. No sectional party can ever do it. But if we could do as our fathers did—organize "committees of safety" all over the cotton States (and it is only in them that we can hope for any effective movement) we shall fire the Southern heart, instruct the Southern mind, give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, at one organized concerted action, we can precipitate the cotton States into a revolution.

The idea has been shadowed forth in the South by Mr. Ruffin; has been taken up and recommended in the Advertiser (the home organ of Mr. Yancey) under the name of "League of United Southerners," who, keeping up their old relations on all other questions will hold the Southern issues paramount, and influence parties, Legislatures and statesmen. I have no time to enlarge, but to suggest briefly.

In haste, yours, &c. W. L. YANCEY.

There you have the whole plan in a nut-shell. The democratic party is to be driven under as the last prop upon which the Federal Union can lean for support—the national Union is to be broken up—chaos is to supplant order—confusion is to predominate and of the debris a Southern Confederacy is to be formed. According to Mr. Yancey's plan, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri and Tennessee are to stand as border States, and those of their people sympathizing with the disunion plan are to remain in the Democratic organization, the better, by *deception*, to consummate their purposes. Witness the execution of the plan in progress. Mr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, is their standard bearer, he is

taken from the democratic ranks with the hope of defeating Mr. Douglas in this State and the South generally—though no possibility of his success. The defeat of Judge Douglas is effectually subversive of his purposes as would the election of Mr. Breckinridge, if not better. And why? Because every vote taken from Douglas so far strengthens Lincoln, whose success they most desire; as they boldly aver that Lincoln's success will be the signal for secession—for a separation of the States.

Whoever questions that the spirit of disunion infects the party of which Maj. Breckinridge has been made the standard-bearer, let him read the annexed testimony, commencing with an article from the N. Y. Herald, a paper in Mr. Breckinridge's support, as follows:

The Disunion Purposes Confessed by the Leading Breckinridge Organ of the United States.

The Irrepressible Conflict Begun at the South.

It is not without the gravest apprehensions for the future that we regard the present threatening position of the political horizon. Ever since the meeting of the Charleston Convention the Disunion party in the South has been preparing for the dissolution of the Confederacy—an event which, at first regarded with the utmost alarm by the great majority of the people North and South, has come latterly to be looked upon as a foregone conclusion—one which might be temporarily averted, but which can, by no means, be entirely averted.

It is time, now, that our people should look at this matter as it stands. We feel bound, therefore, to lay before the country this morning the evidence that the South has already made arrangements to secede peaceably from the Union in the event of the election of Lincoln, who seems morally certain to obtain a majority of votes in the electoral college. We commend, then, to the careful attention of our readers, the elaborate manifesto of the Hon. Lawrence M. Keitt, and the brief, but no less important letter of Hon. William L. Yancey, which will be found in our impression of today. We are aware that both these gentlemen are ranked as "fire-eaters" at the North, but we know, also, that they represent the general feeling in the cotton States, and that the cry of secession, which was raised four years ago, comes up now with redoubled vigor, and that

some of the most prominent Union men in 1856 are now foremost in the ranks of the seceders.

If we examine Mr. Keitt's argument critically, we shall find that his premises are plainly stated, and his conclusions worked out clearly and logically. He employs no bombastic phrases by way of illustration; his style is calm and temperate, and he writes like a man who expresses the deliberate convictions of a powerful party, rather than one who gives vent to his own crude and ill-digested fancies. In his letter the position of the Republican party is fairly stated. He accepts for the party creed Mr. Sumner's views, first, that slavery is barbarous, and the South, necessarily in a savage state; second, that the South, being inferior in every way, is to be held tributary to the North, which section is hereafter to be the sole fountain of political power. What follower of Lincoln's banner can deny that these are the issues of his party, as presented by Sumner, Sumner, Helper and other teachers of the Republican masses. Mr. Keitt proceeds to prove that the "irrepressible conflict" is a living and terrible reality. He asks, pertinently, what would have become of the government had the Black Republicans held the executive power when John Brown fairly took place at Harper's Ferry? His sympathizers would have sided with him as a matter of course, and the land would have been deluged with fraternal blood. The motto of the South is, "Emancipation is the Union, or independence out of it." If the party which John Brown represented succeeded in the next election, "loyalty to the Union will be treason to the South."

Mr. Keitt calls for a union of all parties in the South for Breckinridge and Lane; but he has evidently very little hope of their election. He is prepared for the inevitable result. He advises secession, and points the way towards such a consummation, and closes with a description of the rottenness of our political system, in which, though overdrawn, there is too much that is undeniably true.

The letter of Mr. Yancey advances the same conclusions as that of Mr. Keitt; and since the 10th of June the "League of United Southerners" has not been idle. Already the cotton States are prepared for "revolution." The piece is loaded. The torch is lighted. The cannoner stands by his gun waiting for the fatal signal.

It is not alone the evidence of Messrs. Keitt and Yancey which we have upon this subject. The influential Southern press declare that the issue is between the North and the South, as represented by Lincoln and Breckinridge; that the South will be defended, and that the State Legislatures must be prepared for the worst. In the Gulf States the feeling in favor of secession seems quite unanimous, the border States are undecided, and there is a dark cloud which means mischief hanging over Virginia. The great landed proprietors of the

South believe that, in the event of Lincoln's election, there would be no adequate security for their property and they are, therefore, preparing to re-assume the powers delegated to the general government. We cannot resist the conviction that they are terribly in earnest.

That the South can secede, if united in the movement, there is no reason to doubt. The vote of that section will be given to Breckinridge and Lane. The Southern Senators and members of the House would go to Richmond instead of Washington. Congress being opened in regular form, Mr. Breckinridge would be declared President of the United Southern Republic and the government may be organized in a week after the result of the November election is made known. There is really nothing to prevent such action on the part of the South, and there is every reason to dread that it may take place.

In view of this state of things, we deem it to be our duty to warn parties interested of the danger which threatens them. So far as we can see, the Breckinridge movement of the North will avail nothing. Lincoln will be the Northern President and Breckinridge the Southern. The confusion into which our commercial and monetary affairs will be thrown cannot be described. Trade will receive a blow compared to which the storm of 1857 was mere flurry; stocks will go down to within a fraction of nothing; all kinds of property will depreciate in value, and the fortunes accumulated by years of toil will be swept away in a moment.

We advise our readers to prepare for the coming crisis. Between this time and November something may be heard from the warring Merchants who have dealings with Southern traders will do well to close up such affairs as soon as possible. Holders of Southern stock, railway or city stocks, or securities of the general government, should realize it on this point. Bankers at home and abroad should prepare themselves for the inevitable practical financial affairs. The crisis is imminent. The dissolution of the Union is a fact already determined upon. Let us be prepared to meet the doom which the trailing indifference and crazy fanatics of the day have precipitated upon the Republic.

This is quite strong—sufficiently so to taint the whole party. But I am not disposed to rest the question of procedure. Permit me to call your attention to other witnesses of the fact, that Mr. Yancy's doctrines of secession and disunion have taken a deep root in the South.—Read the subjoined extracts, and say if you can, that disunion is not at the bottom of the secession movement South.—Say if you can, that Mr. Breckinridge and his adherents have not been sold to that unholy interest. Read:

In 1858, in the month of August, a party was formed in the South called the "Great Southern Party." Its object may be understood by reading the first resolution of the Preamble and Resolutions, and the 2nd article of the Constitution of said party as follows:

1st. Resolved, That, with that purity of motive, conscientiousness of rectitude and noble determination to do right, we recommend and will do all we can to bring about an honorable, and if possible, a peaceable separation of the Southern Slave States from the Northern Free States.

Now read article 2 of the Constitution:

ART. 2. Its object is an honorable and, if possible, a peaceful DISMEMBERMENT OF THE PRESENT CONFEDERACY AND THE FORMATION OF A SOUTHERN ONE, securing all the rights, powers and equality to a free white population that may be exercised with safety to ourselves and with justice to all other people.

I think no sensible man can read these resolutions without seeing a determined spirit manifested, at least, on the part of those initiated in the party to dissolve the Union. And in order to train public sentiment in that channel, the youth of the South of 18 years are admitted to membership. This party has an effective organization—even county clubs have been formed for the promotion of the destructive work.

Read the 5th article of their Constitution, thus:

"No member of this Great Southern Party shall recognize any previous party lines, but shall use his elective franchise so as to accomplish, most effectually, the objects set forth in the foregoing Preamble, Resolutions and Constitution."

I might go further and quote from other similar documents, but space is limited. In order to give a glance at the popular feeling of that portion of the Southern people who stand on the Yancy disunion platform, permit me to offer the annexed toasts offered at a 4th of July celebration of the present year, at Camden, S. C.

"The Democratic party—Once glorious, but now fallen—may a united South spring from its ruins."

The Military System of South Carolina. The Richmond Convention—A splendid success. Breckinridge and Lane."

The following toasts were offered on the same day at Waterboro, S. C.:

"By F. G. Schre, Esq.—The day we celebrate—We can now only cherish it for the past. May we soon be able to greet it as the natal day of a Southern Confederacy."

By Edward Davis, Esq.—Col. W. L. Yancy, of Alabama—May he live to be the first President of the Southern Confederacy."

Listen to Hon. W. E. Martin, a delegate to the Convention that nominated Mr. Breckinridge, at a ratification meeting, amongst other things, said:

"The Richmond Convention assembled and, my colleague has told you, we felt when

there that we were sent for the purpose of meeting our Southern brethren. That is to say, although the terms of that call were large enough to embrace all the Democratic States who were in favor of the Platform proposed by the majority at Charleston, you I want to hear expecting to see nobody but Southern people."

Now hear what another of those delegates has to say—Mr. B. H. Rutledge:

"Thus, it is clear, that in all particulars this delegation pursued what they believed to be the principles of the policy prescribed by the State for her direction. They decided throughout any interference with the National organization, but they sympathize in every respect with any proceeding which was essentially Southern in its spirit, and although this movement is conservative so far as it goes, inasmuch as it is a further appeal to the justice and patriotism of the North, still it is indirectly a Southern movement, upon Southern principles, as a united South."

This South has been firm up to this point. If she had 'rattled' the minor points with such resolutions recently, let us hope and pray that, in honor and consistency, she will alone stand firm when the practical flag is run up to the mast-head and nailed there. Upon such an event, every operation of the Federal government ought to be made to stop within the limits of every Southern State. No Judge should administer Federal justice—no Collector should collect Federal customs throughout Southern States. No Southern man should consent to hold office under a commission signed by an Abolition President; and it will be for the people of the South to say whether any Northern man shall be permitted to enter the State lines with such interest."

A correspondent editor of the Intelligencer, printed at Atlanta, Ga., under date of April 21, 1860, writes:

"One of the most important (if not the most important) actions that has yet been had by the delegates, was the action of the Southern delegates last night. An informal meeting was gotten up in the evening, comprising representatives from every Southern delegation except those of Virginia, North Carolina, Mississippi and Tennessee, at which meeting Hon. Wm. L. Yancy was appointed Chairman, and a free expression of opinion was had from the representatives of each delegation. The conclusion arrived at was, that the delegations from each State of the South would stand by and endorse the action of Alabama in the Convention. When you reflect that the Alabama delegation is positively instructed to retire from the Convention immediately, if the Convention refuses to incorporate the 'Protection' clause into its platform, you will at once perceive that the South has taken a very high and noble position, and if she only remains firm, the convention will be obliged to occupy a Southern stand-point, and the South will be safe."

Hon. B. Rhett, says: If the Black Republicans succeed in electing Lincoln and Hamlin, who will openly advocate that slavery be abolished throughout the whole world, then we have to look to ourselves. I am very chary of seeing the South pass resolutions. I am sick at heart of vain attempts to hold out the olive branch, when we should grasp the sword."

Hon. W. P. Miles gives vent as follows: How do we stand now? The South stands upon her own platform, dependent upon her own strong arm for support. We have determined to support men who have cordially indorsed the platform with a Southern code. In that respect we will have, for the first time, the South standing together in solid phalanx. I know both these gentlemen who are our candidates. They are both able, and I believe them both to be sound."

I will close these extracts with one from Gen. Martin, of S. C., a delegate in the Convention that nominated Breckinridge and Lane. At a ratification meeting he is quoted as having said:

And having read carefully his [Breckinridge's] speech delivered at Frankfurt, Kentucky, when he could not have expected a nomination, I am now better satisfied that he is a States Rights man of the first school—more satisfied than I was when I saw him in the Richmond Convention. In that speech he has shown a broad-minded ground that will close as a compromise with and save me a great deal of what I intended otherwise to say. He tells his people that he does not wish to see a very good thing in itself, at any price, to rely upon the democratic party."

we are likely upon themselves. The South must rely upon its own strong arm and be prepared for any and every emergency."

And will night R. G. Scott, a delegate from Alabama, as he is reported to have done in Richmond, Va., unfurl the Breckinridge banner with the war cry of "BRECKINRIDGE OR BLOOD."

Amongst other questions producing excitement in the South is that of re-opening the African slave trade. Hear what the deleaguates have to say on that point of issue between the North and South:

Leader of Gov. Wise, of Va., to ten Governors of Southern States:

RICHMOND, VA., Sept. 15, 1856.

DEAR SIR:—Events are approaching which oblige them to your responsibilities and to mine as chief executives of slave-holding States. Contingencies may soon happen which would require preparation for the worst of evils to the people. Ought we not to admonish ourselves by joint counsel of the extraordinary duties which may devolve upon us from the dangers which so possibly threaten our common peace and safety? When, how, or to what extent may we act, separately or unitedly, to ward off dangers if we can, to meet them most effectually if we must?

I propose that, as early as convenient, the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi and Tennessee, shall assemble at Raleigh, N. C., for the purpose generally of consultation upon the state of the country, and the best means of preserving its peace, and especially of protecting the honor and interests of the slaveholding States. I have addressed the States only having Democratic Executives, for obvious reasons.

This should be done as early as possible, before the Presidential election, and I would suggest Monday, 13th October next. Will you please give me an early answer, and oblige

Yours, most truly and respectfully,
HENRY A. WISE.

His Excellency Thomas W. Ligon,
Governor of Maryland.

I will now introduce an extract of a speech of Mr. Spratt, of S. C., at a meeting of a Southern Convention. He remarked:

"It might be said that the slave trade could not be legalized within the Union, and that to re-establish it, the Union would have to be dissolved. Let it be so. The men of the South had higher trusts than to preserve the Union."

"The power to control Congress had passed irrevocably into the hands of those who expressed remorseless hostility to Southern institutions. Must the South take as law whatever such Congress may dictate? The South could not, of itself, legitimate any action; but should they, therefore, take no steps until legitimated? Must they own the slavish doctrine that power carries with it the right to govern? If the resolutions proposed by him were affirmed by the Convention, the re-opening of the slave trade would leave all the sanction which as Southern men they would ask. (Applause.) If the principle should be approved by Southern sentiment, it matters little what might be the course of Congress. The profits of the trade would compensate the risks of the adventure, and slaves would be brought into the country. Besides that, there was a point of honor involved in this matter. There were men in the South who felt that in this way only could the South take the position that was consistent with the maintenance of her rights. His friend Lamar had already hoisted the slave trade flag, and that flag now floated at the mast-head. (Applause.) If this government, in that madness which precedes dissolution, should send its agents here to spy out the acts of Southern men, to enforce this law, to seize Southern citizens, and take their property for acts which they recognize as right—as sure as the sun should rise it would rise on the smoking plains of another Lexington and Concord!" (Loud applause.)

These lawless and treasonable sentiments, it will be observed, were vigorously applauded by the Convention, and they were probably a fair exposition of its views.

Hon. H. S. Bennett, an ex-Congressman from Mississippi, said:

"That Mississippi would have the slave trade re-opened, peacefully if they could, forcibly if they must. If that was treason, there were 200,000 citizens of Mississippi whose necks were ready for the halter."

Judge Jones, of Ga., is thus reported:

"He proclaimed himself a disunionist since 1829, but he did not believe the Southern States would go out of the Union unless they were kicked out. He believed there was no chance of equality in the Union, and he would rather die a poor wolf in the woods than live a fat dog with any man's collar on his neck. He would no allegiance to any power but God's."

It can hardly be expected that I should present all the proof of the disunion sentiment and purposes of those who are now in this movement. I have resolutions passed by the Legislatures and Conventions of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, South Carolina, and other

Southern States, all breathing the spirit of Disunion, but what has been given must suffice on this occasion.

How many of you, my countrymen, sympathise with this monstrous—this treasonable doctrine?—With this disunion party? But few I trust.

The Breckinridge men charge that Judge Douglas eschews the decisions of the federal court—that he is in issue with that department of the Federal Government. This is a sheer fabrication, and the only show for its support is in garbled extracts from his speeches. I might quote him an hundred times and every quotation would negative the garbled extracts given in evidence against him.—Take the platform on which he stands, with his letter of acceptance and you have his true position. These being before the country supercedes their introduction here.

We daily hear from the lips of some government official that Mr. Douglas, in his Freeport speech in Illinois, departed from the principles of the Cincinnati platform, and therefore is out of the democratic organization. This is about all the bolters have to say, or can say in opposition to Judge Douglas. Well, what did he say? Let him be his own interpreter.—In the U. S. Senate, Feb. 28, 1859, in a speech in reply to Hon. A. G. Brown, of Miss., in opposition to the passage of a Code of Laws by Congress to protect slavery in the territories, Judge Douglas said:

But the Senator says that there is something peculiar in slave property, requiring further protection than other species of property. If so, it is the misfortune of those who own that species of property. He tells us that, if the Territorial Legislature fails to pass a slave code for the Territories, fails to pass police regulations to protect slave property, the absence of such legislation practically excludes slave property as effectually as a constitutional prohibition would exclude it. I agree to that proposition. He says, furthermore, that it is competent for the Territorial Legislature, by the exercise of the taxing power, and other functions within the limits of the Constitution, to adopt unfriendly legislation which practically drives slavery out of the Territory. I agree to that proposition. That is just what I said, and all I said, and just what I meant in my Freeport speech in Illinois, upon which there has been so much comment throughout the country.

But the Senator says that while non-action by the Territorial Legislature excludes slavery; and while the Territorial Legislature may, within the limits of the Federal Constitution, adopt such a system of unfriendly legislation as to effect to exclude slavery from its limits, yet it is wrong for the Legislature to pursue that policy; and, because the Territorial Legislature ought not to adopt that line of policy, he will not be content with such legislation, but will appeal to Congress, and demand a congressional code of laws protecting slavery in the Territories, in opposition to the wishes of the people. Well, sir, his conclusion is a logical one, unless my position is right. All men must agree that non-action by the Territorial Legislature is practical exclusion. If the people of a Territory want slavery, they will protect it by a slave code. If they do not want slavery, if they believe it is not necessary; if they are of opinion that the interests of the Territory would be promoted if they will not furnish the necessary remedies and police regulations, usually called a slave code, for its protection."

In the same speech Judge Douglas, in regard to territorial sovereignty says:

I do not hold that squatter sovereignty is superior to the Constitution. I hold that no such thing as sovereign power attaches to a Territory while a Territory. I hold that a Territory possesses whatever power it derives from the Constitution under the organic act, and no more. I hold that all the power a Territorial Legislature possesses is derived from the Constitution and its amendments, under the act of Congress; and because I held that, I decided last year that the people of a Territory, without the consent of Congress, could assemble at Lexington and create an organic law for that people. I denied the validity of your Lecompte constitution, for the reason that constitutions can only be made by sovereign power; and because the Territory was not a sovereignty, that was not a constitution, but a petition. But, sir, I will not occupy time on that question. The limit of the authority of a Territorial Legislature is the organic act and the Constitution and its amendments. The organic act of Kansas provides, in its sixth section:

"That the legislative power of the Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States and to provisions of this act; but no law shall be passed interfering with the primary disposition of the soil."

The whole legislative power possessed by Congress over a Territory was, by that act, conferred on the Territorial Legislature. There were exceptions on three points; but slavery was not one of the exceptions. I say, then, the intent was to give to the Territorial Legislature all the power that we possessed; all that could be given under the Constitution; and the understanding was, that Congress would not interfere with whatever legislation they might enact.

Here you have the position of Judge Douglas on that point in his own language. And surely no democrat consistent with himself can take issue with that position.

Those of you, fellow-citizens, who have in times past held position in the ranks of democracy have a care how you go whoring after strange gods—have a care how you follow an ignis fatuus, for he assured that you will be led inadvertently into a quagmire—into the slough of political ignominy and disgrace, from which there is no escape. I fear my old friend and fellow-soldier of democracy, Gov. Powell, has been led off in that way; and in all seriousness and good-will do I implore him to retrace his steps, and that speedily, for a yawning gulf is now open to receive him—he stands upon its very brink. To proceed is inevitable and irretrievable ruin.

Having told you, fellow-citizens, that I would furnish data sufficient to satisfy any mind open to conviction that Mr. Douglas is the regular nominee of the democratic party of the Union, in strict accordance with the usages of that party; and that Mr. Breckinridge is in the hands of a band of *disunionists* and *disorganizers*, I will now proceed to redeem that pledge.

First, then, allow me to call your attention to a fact not disputed by any one, that a National Democratic Convention was authoritatively called at Charleston, South Carolina, to come off in the month of April last. Delegates from every State of the Union were regularly appointed and went on. The Convention organized, and adopted the usual rules for its action. The first thing in order was to erect a platform. On this proposition the war commenced. On this the South withdrew. It was well known and understood that Judge Douglas' friends would not adopt a platform without the *non-intervention* plank in it—as well as it is known that they constituted a majority. So the minority, true to their purpose, demanded *intervention* at the expense of disruption. After eight days of excessive labor to no practical purpose, it was agreed to adjourn to Baltimore, to meet again in the month of June. Previously to the adjournment, however, a great number of ballots were had; to the number of 57, by which it was conclusively ascertained that Judge Douglas had a majority of the votes in the Convention. While he was polling, on every ballot 1514, and finally 152½ votes, wanting only 50½ votes to make up the two-thirds of the entire convention, the highest vote that any one man could control in opposition to him was 39—except on the last ballot Mr. Guthrie received a few votes over that number.

In this way the thing went on—and finally, as before remarked, eight of the Southern States (those States alluded to by the celebrated letter of Mr. Yancy which I have incorporated above) went out of the convention—and a few scattering delegates from other States followed the revolutionary example. And here suffer me to remark, the remaining delegates did wrong in not then and there nominating a candidate. They had precedent and authority sufficient in the action of the conventions from '32 to 1856. It was in '48 ruled under similar circumstances, that those remaining, after the secession of the faction of free-soilers, under the lead of Mr. Van Buren, were competent to make a nomination, and they did nominate Gen. Cass, and the action of the Convention had the acquiescence of the party. Instead, however, of pursuing this course they adjourned to Baltimore, where the same difficulty was revived with a determined purpose to disrupt the democratic party, the better to effect the disunion project. Some withdrew, as at Charleston, and the thing, being over two-thirds of the entire convention, nominated Judge Douglas, who now stands before you and the country, the legitimate nominee of the Democratic party of the Union. He comes endorsed to you and the whole country, East, West, North and South by 212 of the 333 votes of the entire convention.

The best face that can possibly be put on the Breckinridge nomination is, that he was taken up by the *bolters*, the *disorganizing seceders*, who met without authority

of the people; a sort of mass meeting of politicians, and presented to the country as a presidential candidate. The meeting that nominated him, according to their own showing, could number but 105 votes—all told—being 6 votes more than they had in the convention. This is a plain, unvarnished relation of facts, devoid of *sophistry* or *deceit*, and cannot be truthfully *converted* by any living man. It is therefore palpable that Mr. Breckinridge has no identity with the democratic party, as a candidate—while it is a palpable that Judge Douglas is the regular nominee of that party. Now, fellow-democrats, the choice has to be made between these two individuals, and it seems to me you can have no possible difficulty in making the proper selection.

What shall I say of Mr. Breckinridge—once the pride of the Kentucky democracy—the man having a stronger hold on the affections of the people of this proud old Commonwealth than any one now living. Nor was his growing popularity confined to this State—its confines were limited only by the boundaries of the Republic. In an evil hour when power tempted ambition, he forgot himself, lost his balance, and like those fording the stream with a bone in his mouth, dropped the substance to grab at the shadow, and so lost all. In this category Mr. Breckinridge now he raised his head above water, minus the bone. Like Lucifer, he has fallen to rise no more, forever. However this may be regretted, fate has decreed it.

How stands the case, taking observation *per se* over the whole Union? There are now before the country four candidates for the Presidency—not one of whom save Judge Douglas, can be properly regarded as a national candidate. All the others are either on a sectional platform or their support is confined to sectional bounds.

Mr. LINCOLN is the Northern Abolition candidate—ho is the only dangerous candidate in opposition to Judge Douglas—the only one that comes in his way as a competitor for the office.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE is a sort of office-holders' candidate—made so by a mass meeting of southern *bolters* and *disorganizers* for *disunion* purposes. He is nothing more, nothing less than a sectional candidate.

Mr. BELL is the candidate of the Union or American party South, and his chances for any considerable vote are gloomy indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS is the National Democratic candidate. His principles, and the platform on which he runs is acceptable to the regular democracy of all parts of the Union, *East, West, North and South*. He is emphatically the People's candidate—the People's choice; and, mark the prediction, he will be the People's President. The fiat has gone forth—the people have become aroused on the questions involved in the contest. They have become sensible of the importance of their interposition to save the Union. They have the will and the power, and *they will save it*. The tide of *sectionalism* is ebbing and flowing in the North and in the South. The waves are found dashing impotently against the impregnable breastworks of public opinion throughout the broad expanse of this glorious Republic. All these parties opposing democracy, or I might more appropriately say, *factions*, must fail of their purposes, and like all their predecessors fall a prey to their own wicked depravity.

Who is legitimately responsible for the division of the democratic party? This is a question of importance, and requires no prophetic forecast to answer it. I will inform you that six hundred and six delegates were appointed and sent on to the Charleston Convention. What did a minority of them do, but to quarrel instead of deliberate? The *minority*—the *secessionists*—were bent upon altering the old platform—they had decreed that new tests which the democracy had for years rejected should be established; and because the majority persistently rejected these tests the seceders *bolted*—left the Convention. These disorganizers pursued their course and finally drew off about 180 of the 696 delegates, who en-

tered fully into the *disunion* organization. This new test is of no practical utility—and I ask, why should it be applied? It was insisted upon for no purpose other than to militate against Judge Douglas, for whom the President and his horde of pensioned satellites, entertained a deadly hostility. There had been no change in our territorial affairs since 1856 calling for a change of policy, and it would puzzle any man to find any solution of this problem other than that which I have given. If the non-intervention policy was good in 1856, it is good in 1860.

The apologists of the seceding faction bestow vast labor in an endeavor to show

that they had been *tricked* by the adoption of the *unit rule* by the Convention. Some say they were *trapped* in other ways. My friends, these are mere *pretexts* to cover up their disorganizing scheme. The truth is, the *bolters* went to Charleston to defeat the nomination of Judge Douglas, or to disrupt the democratic party—for well did they know that Judge Douglas would defeat their revolutionary ends, as did Gen. Jackson in 1832. Here is the secret of the whole thing. Every man not blinded to truth by prejudice, must see it.

It is complained that Judge Douglas, in the language of Gov. Powell, dictated the platform on which alone he would accept the nomination. What sensible man could or would object to this when the whole country had been put in possession of his views—when he had so clearly demonstrated his position that no one could mistake the course he would pursue if elected? How much purer and better is his course than that of Mr. Breckinridge, who stands upon a janus-faced platform on the question of congressional *intervention*? Who can tell from Mr. Breckinridge's letter of acceptance and the "explanatory" resolution of the mass meeting that nominated him, and I will throw Gov. Powell's elucidation with them, whether Mr. Breckinridge and his party would legislate by Congress for the people of a territory on the subject of slavery? I am aware, they say if "necessary" that it would be competent for Congress to do so. The next question presenting itself is, what would be the *character of the legislation*, and *who would judge of the "necessity"* of the case? All these things, fellow-citizens, are for effect—are double intenders. Upon neither proposition has the country a definite answer. While on the other hand, Judge Douglas and his friends proclaim that Congress has no such power, under the Constitution, to legislate over the internal concerns of the people of a territory after a territorial Government had been established—that the inhabitants of such territory, knowing their own wants and interests, are better qualified to judge of and determine their necessities than are the members of Congress, who never saw the country, and know nothing of its soil, climate or productions. Will some Breckinridge man favor the country with the description of legislation he would resort to in Congress for the *protection of slave property in the Territories*? And again, I would ask him to say what would constitute the "necessity" for resorting to that legislation?

I now hurl the gauntlet of defiance at any and every man to point to a single sentence in the Federal constitution, either by express delegation, or by implication that would warrant Congressional legislation for the people of an organized territory. Will some gentleman present the clause? I am anxious to see it if it exists!—I deny its existence!—I challenge its production! Wishing to be distinctly understood on this point, and as not denying that it would be legitimate for Congress to act on a *petition* of the people of a territory seeking at the hands of the federal government a proper *defense* of the right of person or property against invasion from either external or internal violence. Power for that purpose is abundantly delegated, and duty prompts its exercise, as well in aid of States as Territories.

I now hurl the gauntlet of defiance at any and every man to point to a single sentence in the Federal constitution, either by express delegation, or by implication that would warrant Congressional legislation for the people of an organized territory. Will some gentleman present the clause? I am anxious to see it if it exists!—I deny its existence!—I challenge its production! Wishing to be distinctly understood on this point, and as not denying that it would be legitimate for Congress to act on a *petition* of the people of a territory seeking at the hands of the federal government a proper *defense* of the right of person or property against invasion from either external or internal violence. Power for that purpose is abundantly delegated, and duty prompts its exercise, as well in aid of States as Territories.

Let me tell you, friends, this is a wide mistake—it is not dead. True, it is somewhat divided at this moment, but die it will not. Like the

polypus it will continue to live though you tear it into ten thousand fragments and scatter them to the winds. The principles of the democratic party never can die—they are founded on eternal *Truth* and *Justice*, are immutable and indistructible and cannot perish on earth. Nations may sink into oblivion, Empires crumble into dust, and organized parties may dissolve, but the immutable principles of democracy unchanged and unchanging are connected with the principle of man that they must live on through all ages to eternity. And while time lasts you will find men daring to elevate its banner and range themselves under its ample folds. Though disruption recently cast despondency and gloom over the genuine democracy of the land—though disintegration is apparent, yet the party, under the gallant lead of Douglas and Johnson, the scattered forces are re-rallying, having sloughed off its impure and tainted elements, will stand forth again pure and regenerated, putting forth its branches vigorous as the young palm. The banner has been thrown to the breeze; under that banner the tramp of millions is heard marching on to victory over sectionalism and disunion—anarchy and ruin.

In conclusion allow me to utter a sentence in the way of exhortation. Such of you, my readers, as have estranged yourselves from the party—as have been seduced into the *secession* ranks in the full confidence of the uprightness and purity of John C. Breckinridge—you do I beseech to call a halt, survey the premises you occupy, wheel back into line and join on the left of the Democratic column under the proud old flag up-borne by that ablest and purest of living statesmen, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. This you may do without sacrifice of principle, and by so doing save the country from impending ruin.

The humble individual who now addresses you, devoted thirty years to active labor on the political arena, ever true to the pure, unadulterated principles of democracy, as enunciated by Jefferson and practised by Jackson and those democrats who have filled the Executive office at the summons of the democratic people; but some five years ago retired from the field of active service, determined never again to take part in the political conflicts of the country. But a new era has dawned—the country is in danger—not from external foes, but from internal feuds. The *vultures* of party are astide the body politic with their talons fastened in the flesh, whetting their beaks for a feast upon the vitals of our glorious Union. In view of this alarming aspect I once more put on the old armor, with the rust of years upon it, determined to lend my feeble aid in averting the dire calamity with which the institutions of our beloved country is so seriously threatened.

CITY JUDGE'S OFFICE.

First Cross street, bet. Main & Front Sts.
(Building recently occupied by Y. E. Allen.)
C. W. HUTCHINSON. (W. W. CARR, City Judge.)
C. W. Hutchin is authorized to take Depositions.

TERMS OF CIVIL COURTS.
THIRD MONDAY OF
March, June, September and December.
May 21, 1860-y

The Daily Evening Journal.

G. F. COOKERLY, Editor.

TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA.

Monday, August 13, 1860.

FOR PRESIDENT,

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS,
OF ILLINOIS.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT.

HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON,
OF GEORGIA.

Col. Thompson declared in his speech, on Saturday night, that Douglas would not get the electoral vote of a single State. As he has proven himself, on various occasions, the most false of all the prophets, it is reasonable to suppose that he will prove so again. The Col. will wake up after the election and find out, to his sorrow, that Douglas is elected. He has observed the signs of the times to but little advantage when he asserts that Lincoln will be elected President. Has the gentleman not yet heard from the Missouri election? Does any sane man now doubt that Douglas will carry that State in November?

HON. PIERRE SOULE'S OPINION OF ILLINOIS POLITICS.—Louisiana is for Douglas for the Presidency. The Hon. Pierre Soule, the great leader of the Louisiana Democracy, has declared for Douglas in his contest for the Senatorship, and denounces the Washington Union. We find this cheering intelligence in the special Washington correspondence of the New York Times of Aug. 27. It is conveyed in the following terms:

"Mr. Soule expresses the confident opinion that the Democracy can alone succeed in 1860 with Senator Douglas as their nominee for the Presidency, and that there is but one opinion in this State as to the course of the Washington Union. He says while the Democracy of Louisiana condemn the unnatural war upon Judge Douglas, they regard the editorials of the Union as tending to secure his election in Illinois and his nomination at Charleston."

There is no particle of doubt but that Mr. Soule's sentiments are those of the body of the people of Louisiana. While, therefore, Slidell has been spending his time in Chicago, exerting himself to divide the Democratic party for the express and only purpose of defeating Senator Douglas, the right sort of public opinion has been forming in his own State. The true essential principle of popular sovereignty cannot be resisted; and the champion of that principle cannot be put down.—[Chicago Times.]

~~12~~ We take the following extract from a speech delivered at the great Democratic Mass meeting held at Springfield, Illinois, on Wednesday, the 25th instant, by Col. W. A. Richardson.

The Col. was in the Mexican war and knows whereof he speaks.

Read it, patriotic citizens, and then see if you can support Mr. Lincoln:

Fellow citizens, I don't know why they are so anxious to say that I have a choice between Lincoln and Breckinridge. If the fiery furnace were on one side and the deep sea on the other, I know which way I would go, but I don't mean to be driven to choose in advance. I am for Stephen A. Douglas against them and all the world. If they can make any capital out of my position they are welcome to it. My friend Mr. Allen related several things in the life of Mr. Lincoln, but omitted one or two chapters which I propose to follow up. While Lincoln was a member of the Legislature he got one bill through. It took him some time to get it through, but he did it. The bill authorized a man named Musick to keep a tollbridge across Salt Creek. Well, he did another thing. Within thirty days after he took his seat in Congress—after our army had fought its way to the capital of Mexico—after our battles had been fought and victories won—after the stars and stripes had floated above the halls of the Montezumas—a man by the name of Hudson from Massachusetts, on the 30th of January, 1848, introduced a resolution directing the President of the United States to withdraw the army from Mexico, and bring it back to the desert between the Nueces and Rio Grande, and make peace without indemnity. When that proposition came forward, Lincoln voted for it. Suppose that policy had prevailed, would you have had that vast territory lying upon the Pacific? Would you have had brought into your midst sixty millions of dollars annually from California? Why was that procrastinated from January until in the summer of the next year? It was because Lincoln and his party in Congress steadily, daily and hourly, taught those Mexicans to believe they could hold out until our armies would be withdrawn. I charge upon him and them the lives of those gallant men that were lost from January until July, by holding out inducements to the enemy to procrastinate the war, instead of making peace.

A Voice—We'll put our foot upon him in November.

8/29/1860

EVENING TRANSCRIPT.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, SEPT. 5, 1860.

SECOND EDITION.

POLITICAL INTIMIDATION. The Republicans have one advantage in the approaching Presidential election, which they did not possess in 1856. Then they were threatened with a dissolution of the Union in case they elected their candidate; now all parties seem to concur in the principle that the government must be sustained whoever is chosen President. Some Southern politicians still indulge in menaces, but even in South Carolina it is doubtful if the disunion party be in a majority.

The assertion of the South in 1856, that it would break up the government in the event of the election of Fremont, was the most impudent element ever introduced into our politics. It could not be sustained on the ground that Fremont had no party in the Slave States, for the fact that he had no party there was one of the wrongs which needed redress. There was nothing in his opinions which would justify the South in opposing them by revolution; for his opinions were identical with those of many Southern statesmen of a former period; and fifteen years ago they would not have been considered sufficiently objectionable to prevent his having a party in the Slave States.

Mr. Fillmore received Southern votes when he was elected Vice President, though it was understood at the South that he was a slavery restrictionist. Mr. Webster always professed, not only to be in favor of the principle embodied in the Wilmot Proviso, but to be surprised at its being called by Wilmot's name, when he had preceded Wilmot in affirming it. Mr. Choate, in the Taylor campaign, said that Northern whigs were divided from Southern only by this question, and on this question the Northern whigs would vote the Southern whigs down. Mr. Clay, as late as 1850, declared that his right arm should wither before he would vote slavery into a free territory.

Southern politicians therefore in taking the ground, that a government elected on the principle of the Wilmot Proviso was a government "not fit to be obeyed," made a great and palpable advance from the position they had formerly occupied, and it was important to resist them if only to make them return to their old ground. If they can this year insist that no candidate shall have a party in the slave States unless he is a slavery extensionist, and that no candidate elected by the free States shall be allowed to administer the government, they can next year take a similar position in regard to the African slave trade, and make the preservation of the Union depend on the consent of the North to re-open that traffic. There is no innovation so foolish or so wicked that they cannot introduce, if they are allowed to frighten the people of the free States out of their right to vote as they please by threats of dissolving the Union.

THE MOTHER OF DOUGLAS. However strongly Mr. Douglas may be opposed on political grounds, and however partizan may be the judgments expressed of his public life, we have been pleased to find that everybody gives him credit for the tenderness and strength of his filial affection. The object of his journey North was to visit his mother, and though, by a series of unfortunate accidents, he did not succeed in his purpose, he still never relinquished it. There is a fear that the mother was lost in the various crowds that flocked to see the son. For the last month nothing has been heard of her. Her disconsolate son has gone South, in the hope of finding her at Richmond, Charleston, or New Orleans. The number of people who assemble to see him at every stopping place on his route, shows how deep and sincere is the public sympathy in his affliction. The most cynical and selfish politicians are not hardened enough to witness the heroic search of this devoted son without pity and bewilderment; and in the private

caucuses where they concoct their schemes of public plunder, the question—"has Douglas found his mother yet?" even precedes the question—"how shall we divide the spoils?"

It has, we know, been maliciously suggested that, as Mr. Douglas passed years without exhibiting any desire to see his mother, it was somewhat singular that the feeling should have happened to break out so violently at the present time. Persons who make this suggestion only prove their ignorance of the working of the human heart in those characters who are distinguished for fortitude. In such persons we often witness a power of endurance, which seems almost superhuman, suddenly give way without apparent cause. A beautiful example of this is found in the case of that old lady whose husband had been dead for thirty years. To the astonishment of her friends she one day burst into a flood of tears, exclaiming that she "could not hold in any longer." We think that Mr. Douglas has valiantly held in for about the same period, and with what a rush his affection now comes out, the world has witnessed with wondering admiration.



